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1. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**

[ ]  If the list of PLOs in the drop-down menu is not correct, please contact the Assessment Coordinator.

1. PLOs are written in an assessable format reflecting a single, measurable action word from Bloom’s Taxonomy.

[ ]  The action word central to each PLO is student-centered and indicates the level of learning complexity expected of students (i.e. action words show alignment with Bloom’s taxonomy).

[ ]  Each PLOs is written in a format that makes it assessable (one measurable action word, one specified object of the action.

1. PLOs represent a variety of discipline-specific knowledge areas, skills, and dispositions.

[ ]  PLOs indicate multiple different discipline-specific knowledge areas, skills, and/or dispositions, as indicated by different specified actions and/or objects).

[ ]  Each PLO is distinct from other PLOs, so that the various PLOs do not overlap.

1. The focal PLO is identified.

[ ]  Focal PLO is clearly indicated, and consistent through the report

1. **Current Curriculum Map**
	1. The curriculum map is sufficiently detailed to be useful for evaluating the program.

\*The map does not need to show ALL course offerings in the program, just those that are integral to student achievement of learning outcomes. A ***Curriculum Map Template*** is available through CITL.

[ ]  The curriculum map shows a matrix of courses and all PLOs.

[ ]  The matrix indicates which courses are required of all students and which courses form requirement clusters that fulfill the same programmatic requirements, and from which students choose one or more courses, making the pathways that students follow to proficiency clear.

[ ]  The map or legend indicates how students are expected to progress through the program (e.g., any sequence to course enrollment or prerequisite relationships are indicated).

* 1. The curriculum map clearly depicts the courses/experiences that will allow students to meet all PLOs.

[ ]  Information on how each course contributes to relevant PLOs is provided, indicating the level of PLO proficiency supported by the course.

[ ]  The progression in supported proficiency coincides with the order in which students take courses (i.e. developing courses are taken before Mastery courses)

[ ]  Students are able to achieve the highest indicated level of proficiency for all PLOs in the courses that are **required** for the major, so that electives need not be included in the map.

1. **Summary of Previous Results**
	1. An abstract describes previous assessment methods and results with enough information for comparison with the current assessment, if applicable.

[ ]  Previous results are reported in the table, indicating the numbers of students who exceeded, met, partially met, or failed to meet performance criteria for the focal PLO.

[ ]  A verbal summary of student performance including the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations during the previous assessment is provided for comparison to current results, assuming different numbers of students are evaluated each time assessment occurs.

[ ]  The summary includes information on where prior assessment occurred (course/non-embedded assessment; specific section and/or instructor).

[ ]  The summary includes information on when (the terms and years) the data were collected and reported.

[ ]  The summary includes summary of assessment procedures e.g. Type of instrument is detailed (assignment scored with rubric; a set of exam questions; questionnaire/survey)

[ ]  How student achievement of the PLO was evaluated (i.e. criteria for deciding that students exceeded, met, partially met or did not expectations for the PLO, [e.g. met a specified set of criteria on rubric, or earned specific total scores on a set of exam questions, etc.)

* 1. Summary of Assessment Subcommittees comments/suggestions

[ ]  A summary of suggestions made by the reviewers the last time the focal PLO was reviewed is detailed.

[ ]  Dates are provided for faculty meeting discussion of assessment committee feedback on the assessment report.

[ ]  A summary of the program’s response to feedback demonstrates thoughtful consideration of suggestions provided.

1. **Description of Previous Actions**
	1. There is an explicit statement of the changes (or not) to curriculum, instruction, or assessment methods based on previous assessment of the focal PLO, including accountability procedures.

[ ]  A summary of what actions the program took in response to the previous assessment is provided.

[ ]  Details on changes to curriculum, assessment, instruction and/or advising/mentoring taken to improve student achievement are provided, including how/what the changes are expected to improve student performance.

[ ]  A mechanism for verifying that proposed changes to instruction/advising have occurred is detailed, along with any data pertaining to implementation of said changes

[ ]  If no changes were made, an explanation of why no changes were made is provided that carefully demonstrates thoughtful consideration of the program’s efficacy.

1. **Current Assessment Strategies/Measures/Techniques/Methods**
	1. A description of assessment methodology (e.g. course, semester, instrument, constituency, method of analysis) is sufficiently detailed as to be repeatable

[ ]  A description of methodology is provided.

[ ]  The description details **where** the assessment took place (the course number, sections, instructor)

[ ]  The description details **who** were assessed (e.g. majors in their last semester before graduation).

[ ]  The description details **when assessment data were collected** (the semester/s and years being reported)

[ ]  The description details the nature of the assessment instrument (e.g. project, paper, exam, etc.)

[ ]  The description details how performance of students was analyzed (Was a rubric used for scoring? What criteria were included in the rubric? Which rubric criteria were relevant to the PLO in question?)

[ ]  The method of determining whether students exceed/meet/partially meet/don’t meeting expectations for the PLO is sufficiently detailed as to be repeatable

* 1. Useful documents are appended.

[ ]  Documents are appended, including rubrics, test questions, and assignment instructions.

[ ]  These documents provide full insight into the assessment that occurred, and can be used to determine alignment of the assessment to the PLO)

* 1. Assessment methods align with the PLO, and provide a detailed measurement of student achievement

[ ]  The type of assessment used aligns well with the focal PLO action and Bloom’s level.

[ ]  The assessment includes sufficient criteria/questions/level of performance to detect differences between students (Assessments should provide an ability to distinguish between students who have achieved high levels of knowledge and skills, those who have achieved adequate knowledge and skills, those who have made progress toward the learning outcome, but may not yet be at the minimum level, and those who have not learned much of what you want them to learn at all

[ ]  The assessment methodology measures the zone of actual student development (i.e. not repeated efforts/resubmission after comments), or a justification for measuring the achievement in the zone of proximal development is provided.

* 1. An explicit benchmark is provided.
* In Assessment of Student Learning within a program, a **benchmark** is defined as the percent of students meeting or exceeding performance expectations for a specific learning outcome that your program is attempting to meet. The benchmark is a means of gauging the performance of the **program** as a learning platform. It details the overall performance of the **PROGRAM**, not of individual students, but allows us to compare measurements of student learning across time.
* Because the goal of assessment is to use data on student performance to make adjustments to curriculum, instruction, or assessment practices to improve student learning or the measurement of student learning, the **best** benchmarks are often derived from previous assessment results. If the PLO has not been previously assessed, your program may use a “desired” goal for a benchmark. If a specific proportion of students must meet or exceed PLO mastery requirements for external accreditation, you may also state or use this goal as a benchmark, but you must explain how you will use such benchmarks to measure changes in student learning over time, or to gauge the efficacy of changes you’ve made to the learning platform.
	1. A justification for the benchmark is provided that indicates understanding of how the benchmark is used to evaluate changes in student learning

[ ]  A justification is provided that shows how the program is using the benchmark to gauge changes in student learning. (And)

[ ]  The benchmark chosen is appropriate (based on previous assessment results)

* 1. Useful documents (e.g. descriptions of assignments, rubrics) are attached as appendices as necessary.

[ ]  Documents are appended, including rubrics, test questions, and assignment instructions.

[ ]  These documents provide full insight into the assessment that occurred and can be used to determine alignment of the assessment to the PLO.

1. **Current Assessment Results/Findings/Interpretations**
	1. A verbal summary of assessment results is present.
	2. Assessment results are critically analyzed. What the results indicate about student learning and the educational platform provided by the program to allow students to achieve the learning outcome is meaningfully summarized, as are any issues associated with the assessment procedure itself]

[ ]  A critical analysis of the educational effectiveness of the program in helping student reach the highest level of performance on the focal PLO.

[ ]  An explicit statement about whether the results exceeded, met, or didn’t meet the benchmark for program performance.

[ ]  Data are compared to previous results (including distribution of scores across achievement categories) and whether improvement in learning has occurred is discussed.

[ ]  The effectiveness of any changes in assessment, curriculum, instruction, and/or advising/mentoring made in response to the previous round of assessment are discussed

[ ]  Any patterns or trends are discussed (e.g. if students who didn’t take a particular elective did worse than students who took the course; If students in one section did worse than in another section, etc.), or the absence of patterns is noted

[ ]  Any problems with the design, alignment, and/or administration of the assessment are discussed, or absence of problems is mentioned (If you don’t have internal data, contact the Office of Institutional Research for help looking for patterns).

one section did worse than in another section, etc.

1. **Current Implications/Actions**
	1. An explanation of how the results can be used to improve student achievement through changes to curriculum, instruction, assessment methods, and/or advising/mentoring is provided, along with a plan for how compliance with changes will be verified. A justification is provided if the department does not think student achievement can be improved.

[ ]  A discussion of how the results can inform departmental strategies to improve student achievement of the focal PLO is present.

[ ]  The discussion specifically addresses remediation of any problems identified with the assessment, curriculum, instruction, or advising/mentoring noted in the discussion of results. Remediation may include changes to the assessment assignment/instrument, changes to courses that support development of focal PLO (e.g. changes to instruction/content, addition of assignments, changes to existing assignments, changes to course learning outcomes, etc.), changes to curriculum (addition or removal of courses), and/or changes to advising/mentoring.

[ ]  A detailed and feasible plan for timelines and/or monitoring to ensure that changes are carried out is proposed.

[ ]  If no changes are suggested, a justification for the reasoning behind doing nothing to improve student learning is provided.

1. **Dissemination of findings.**
	1. The report has been shared with and approved/discussed by faculty.

[ ]  The means by which the report has been shared with the program faculty are presented.

[ ]  The date of a faculty/program meeting in which the current assessment report was discussed and approved is provided. (Attach minutes or agenda)

1. **Updated Five-Year Assessment Plan.**
	1. The plan covers (at least) five years into the future from the current year.

[ ]  An assessment plan for the NEXT five years is provided.

* 1. The plan makes explicit when, where, and how each PLO will be assessed, and when it will be reported.

[ ]  The plan indicates **when** each PLO will be assessed (i.e. when the program will collect data—is it ongoing and collected each term? Each year? Or only during a specific year/term?)

[ ]  The plan indicates **where** each PLO will be assessed (i.e. In a specific course or courses, designated by course number and title, or through a non-embedded artifact, such as a student portfolio or standardized test).

[ ]  The plan indicates **how** each PLO will be assessed by indicating the assessment instrument (i.e. Is there a paper, project, or exam? Is there a rubric evaluating criteria for mastery of the PLO? Is there a total score? A subset of questions on a standardized exam?)

[ ]  The plan indicates **when** assessment results for each PLO will be **reported** to the assessment subcommittee (i.e. year of report).

* 1. The plan will result in all PLOs being assessed and reported within a 5-year cycle.

[ ]  The plan includes all PLOs being assessed within 5 years.